

~~SECRET~~

NPIC/D-386/70

25X1
MEMORANDUM FOR [REDACTED]

SUBJECT : Comments on the Outline for the History of NPIC
Relations with Foreign Governments

1. This outline is a good start. I see no difficulty on our agreeing on a final version. I think it desirable, however, to anticipate as many questions as possible before we release it for criticism outside the Center.

2. I'm not sure the title needs to be so long. It is possible that the title need only be something like "Relationships with Foreign Government." My experience in the program is too limited to speak with authority on this one, but the few outlines I have seen to date do not name the component in the title. We can get guidance from Roberta on this one.

3. If my impressions are correct, there may be good reason for discussing the relations with [REDACTED] at least. However, there may be question about the characterization of [REDACTED] government as being European. Incidentally, were there no significant relations with [REDACTED]

4. How were these dealings with foreign governments authorized? Is there any documentation of this facet of the dealings? I think this question will arise, if it is not dealt with.

5. I'm not clear about the meaning of the "Indirect Role Played by NPIC." I think there might well be two or more points under this heading.

6. Beginning with Roman five and continuing through Roman seven, I think the outline is too cryptic. It would be more helpful for the critic, if some inkling were given in the major headings as to the thrust of the reporting on each country. Or, if the thrust of the discussion is to be quite different in each country, it may be necessary to indicate the thrust for the individual countries. Perhaps what was done in subsections A, B, and C of Roman V may suffice.

Declass Review by NIMA/DOD

~~SECRET~~

SECRET

SUBJECT: Comments on the Outline for the History of NPIC
Relations with Foreign Governments

7. I think the major heading for Roman eight might be made more specific. Presumably, you will have been showing significance in each case as you proceed with your interpretive history. Will this be more in the nature of a summary? Or, a conclusion? Or, an assessment of the gains and costs of the whole program?

8. I'll be taking some year-end leave on 23, 28, and 30 December, if my present plans hold. If these dates should happen to afford little opportunity for our getting together, however, I can change my plans so as to provide an early opportunity to get together.

[Redacted]
NPIC Historical Officer

25X1

Distribution:

- Orig & 1 - Addressee
- 1 - NPIC Historical Officer
- 2 - NPIC/ODIR

NPIC/Hist: [Redacted] 22Dec70)

25X1

SECRET

NPIC/D-381-70

17 DEC 1970

MEMORANDUM FOR: Chairman, DDI Historical Board

SUBJECT : Comments on the Outline Dated December 1970

25X1

1. I certainly concur in the remarks you made on the buck slip. To me, this outline is too topical and too mechanical. In being so topical, there are few clues that there will be much integration of the facts with respect to time. Indeed, if I did not know, I would never guess that this was supposed to be an historical contribution. In being too mechanical, it is much too pat. The critic is left to guess and to hope that the final product will be acceptable.

2. I think I am initially frightened by the proposed first section. I have visions of the writer discussing this controversial subject for its own sake. My guard might not have gotten so high had he commenced with the section he has numbered Roman two. He could still have touched upon the nature and scope of geography in the context of its role in intelligence without arousing so many suspicions.

3. I think it would be interesting, in this connection, to discuss the philosophy of geography that prevailed in the Agency, and why that point of view. It might be significant to see how the point of view evolved -- if it did change -- with changes in leadership and requirements. There is, however, no evidence to suggest that the writer will explore such things and thus relate the nature and scope of the discipline specifically to the situation in OBG and its predecessor organizations.

4. I, personally, have difficulty in regarding what the writer calls the "human resource base," the "geographical data base," and the "external contact programs" as parallel subsections under one major category. I think they will make uncomfortable bedfellows, and wish him luck in writing his introduction to what he calls the "geographical intelligence resource base."

5. I would much prefer, were I doing the job, to break what he calls the "human resource base" (but I don't like the label) out as a separate major topic. I likewise feel that there must be some relation

25X1
SUBJECT: Comments on the [] Outline Dated December 1970

between the type of person hired and the type of training provided, on the one hand, and a) the concept of geography prevailing in the Agency, and b) the collection programs, the kind of data collected, the way it was manipulated, and the resulting products, on the other. Moreover, there may have been interesting evolutionary developments in these relationships as time went by.

6. In the event the foregoing approach were chosen, I would probably choose to break out what he calls "data collection" as a separate major topic -- and the same for "data management" (ugh!).

7. I can't see "external contact programs," ("C"), as a separate subheading parallel in importance to "A" and "B." I'm not sure what the "departmental contact program" was, or is, but I suspect both it and the "personal service consultant program" could be incorporated in one of the other sections in what he designates Roman three.

8. The foregoing comments assume tacitly that the final outline will bear some resemblance to the current one. If for no other reason, the relationships of this piece to other related OBGI contributions may increase the inertia to change. I think it a mistake, however, to suppose that no other approach is practicable. If there were significant changes in these aspects of the Agency geographic program over the years, and if the changes were sufficiently clear -- and I suspect this is the case -- then it should be possible to define the major categories in the outline on the basis of historic periods. Not only would this be more likely to result in an historical treatment, but it would also ensure that each topic was discussed in the context of what was happening in the Agency and the intelligence community. It would also call for a discussion of the interaction of forces bringing about the changes and should, thus, ensure against each of the several subsections being discussed for its own sake and in a vacuum.

[]
NPIC Historical Officer

Distribution:

- Original & 1 - Addressee
- 1 - NPIC Historical Officer
- 2 - NPIC/ODIR

NPIC/ODIR [] 7 Dec 70)